DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 108 HE 024 094

AUTHOR Stern, Kenneth S.
TITLE Bigotry on Campus: A Planned Response.
INSTITUTION American Jewish Committee, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE May 90
NOTE 34p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56 St., New York, NY 10022-2746 ($3.50).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Anti Semitism; *Change Strategies; College Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Discrimination; Higher Education; Jews; *Minority Groups; Racial Discrimination; Religious Discrimination; *Social Discrimination; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The paper analyzes the problem of campus bigotry with emphasis on anti-semitic incidents, identifies effective and ineffective responses, and suggests a plan for college administrators to follow. The following questions are briefly considered: why should we care about bigotry on campus? is bigotry on campus really increasing? and why is there an increase of bigotry on campus? Universities are encouraged to be prepared by having both a response plan in the case of an incident and a preventive plan to reduce the level of bigotry on campus. General principles are offered concerning the following: graffiti; physical violence and its victims; disciplinary codes; speakers; campus security and other "front line" staff; and intergroup relations experts. Also discussed are planned bigotry reduction, conducting a bigotry survey to assess the problem, and the responsibility to effect change in all educational institutions including grade and high schools. An appendix outlines response plan highlights, prejudice reduction plan highlights, and a list of groups that need to develop the commitment to, and structures for, managing diversity. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328108

BIGOTRY ON CAMPUS

A Planned Response

Kenneth S. Stern

HE 024 094

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
American Jewish Committee
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56 Street, New York, NY 10022-2746

BIGOTRY ON CAMPUS

A Planned Response

Kenneth S. Stern

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56 Street, New York, NY 10022-2746

Kenneth S. Stern is program specialist on anti-Semitism and extremism for the American Jewish Committee.

Copyright © 1990 The American Jewish Committee
All rights reserved

FOREWORD

Last fall a group of Jewish students were attacked outside the Hillel building at Brooklyn College. They were beaten with fists, and assaulted with slurs.

Last fall I also attended a meeting of college presidents in Washington, D.C. It had been scheduled before the beating of our students, and its agenda was especially timely -- the increase of incidents of bigotry on campuses. The many distinguished experts at the Washington meeting talked mostly about the free speech limitations of college disciplinary codes. My colleagues and I heard what we couldn't do, not what we could do.

The American Jewish Committee's paper -- "Bigotry on Campus: A Planned Response" -- tells us what we can do. It analyzes incidents of campus ethnoviolence from around the country, and suggests concrete plans to counter bigotry in higher education.

More than that, the paper makes a statement: That universities owe their students a comfortable environment without the traumatic distractions of bigotry, and that university presidents must set a tone that cultivates that environment.

Our institutions of higher education are attracting more and more diverse students -- many of whom have not been taught the skills needed to live in a multiethnic, multicultural society. "Bigotry on Campus: A Planned Response" offers a realistic approach that encourages structures for teaching about and managing diversity, not only so that tensions are reduced, but as an educational good.

The paper is forward looking, thoughtful, and an important contribution. If the suggestions made here are followed, our students will be better equipped to thrive in an increasingly diverse world.

Dr. Robert L. Hess,
President, Brooklyn College
City University of New York

PREFACE

Reports of an increase in anti-Semitic, racist, anti-Asian and other bigoted incidents on campus have sparked widespread concern. While there are generalized impressions about the scope of this problem and some useful responses to it, we have not to date had a systematic accounting or a comprehensive set of practical program suggestions to combat hate in university life.

Kenneth Stern, AJC's program specialist on anti-Semitism, has conducted a thorough review of campus incidents since 1986. He has researched a unique archive of thousands of articles housed at the National Institute Against Violence and Prejudice. He has assessed both the nature of these incidents as well as what methods have proven effective, and which counterproductive, in creating a more tolerant atmosphere.

To assure that the practical program recommendations listed in this paper will indeed prove effective on campus, AJC convened two consultations of university presidents, one in New York, another in Cincinnati, to review our findings and action proposals. Several of their suggestions are incorporated in this paper. Their strong consensus was that this is a useful document that should be taken seriously by university administrators, student leaders and community relations professionals. We hope it will contribute to a more positive campus environment in this decade and beyond.

Gary Rubin,
Director of Natu al Affairs
American Jewish Committee

BIGOTRY ON CAMPUS: A PLANNED RESPONSE

"I wish they had hit me!"

That was what Eric C. delos Santos, a student at Brown University, wrote in his school newspaper.

Seven white male students had taunted him. Delos Santos is an Asian American.

"I felt empty . . .," Santos explained. "I wish they had hit me . . . At least I would be able to *physically* show the scars the words 'ching' and 'chang' left on my being. Brown security, the disciplinary review board, and the general student body would not care to hear how [I was] chipped away emotionally. They want blood. They want proof that it happened. Only then could [I] truly have been hurt -- in their eyes."

Incidents of bigotry are becoming commonplace on college campuses. According to the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence (NIAPV), more than 250 of the nation's 3,300 colleges and universities have reported acts of ethnoviolence since mid-1986. Many more incidents on many campuses have gone unreported.

Campus officials say they don't know what to do. Incidents vary in origin, and burst on the scene unpredictably. Some are very complex as, for example, when a faculty member says something that some people interpret as bigoted, while others do not; or when pressures from the outside community come into play, dividing the campus along previously unobserved seams, all under the watchful eyes of the media. Incidents also raise different institutional concerns and passions, frequently challenging the university's self-image, pitting academic freedom against the need for a campus free from ethnic and racial hostility.

Swastikas. Cross burnings. Arson. Date rape. Assaults motivated by racial hatred. T-shirts with homophobic slurs. Shouts of "JAP! . . . JAP! . . . JAP!" from the crowd as a Jewish student walked to her seat at a sporting event. Whispers of "nigger" by a member of the board of trustees. KKK literature. Campus security checking African American male, but not white male, identification at a school dance. Graffito: "You're a fucking asshole and I hope you die eating matzoh." A faculty member using the term "Jap test" to describe a surprise exam. A note with the word "Spic!" slid under a student's door. Hate mail: "Custer should have finished off your entire degenerate race." A picture in a school newspaper showing African American students at a concert,

with the caption "Music soothes the savage beast." Palestinian students displaying a poster of a kaffiyeh-clad woman protruding through the center of a yellow Star of David, her legs spread, her sandals untied, blood dripping from her thighs. The Black Student Union inviting Minister Louis Farrakhan to speak. A professor inviting Ku Klux Klan members to address his class.

Incidents like these are charged with racial, religious, sexist, homophobic and ethnic tension. They tear at the tranquility of academic institutions.

Why is this happening? What should officials do when an incident occurs? More importantly, what should officials do *before* an incident occurs? How effective are codes against bigoted behavior?

These, and other related questions, are difficult to answer. What if the professor who invited KKK members wanted to teach his students how to sharpen their interview skills so they could expose bigots?

If a student can be expelled for engraving a swastika on an African American student's door in the dead of night (this is vandalism), what about the student who distributes a swastika-covered leaflet to African American students (First Amendment right)?

What should the university do if the perpetrator is never found? Or if found, how does the perpetrator's due process rights limit the administration's response?

And what about the students like delos Santos, the people who bear psychological scars more devastating than if "they had hit" him? Should the school help him recover, and if so how?

What is the underlying, everyday level of bigotry on campus, and how does this relate to the explosions? Even if there are no explosions, what should campuses be doing to help students enjoy healthy intergroup relations? What should universities be doing to prepare students for life in an increasingly diverse society?

This paper attempts to respond to these difficult questions, and others. Of course, campuses differ, and what may hold true at a large urban school may not apply at a smaller, more rural campus. But there are certain patterns and principles that the American Jewish Committee has gleaned from its study of campus bigotry, which included a review of NIAPV's files. This paper analyzes the problem, examines responses -- ones that have worked, ones that haven't -- and suggests a plan for administrators to follow.

WHY SHOULD WE CARE ABOUT BIGOTRY ON CAMPUS?

Bigotry has always been on campus. Whereas some of today's university administrators may be insensitive to problems of intergroup hatred, their predecessors practiced it. Jews were tolerated, but only in small numbers. African Americans -- and on many campuses women -- weren't welcome at all.

This institutionalized discrimination has almost disappeared. Certainly it is better that an African American or Hispanic or Asian or Jew or woman be called an offensive name than not be allowed into the university at all.

Yet years ago slurs were confined to scribblings on bathroom walls. Today's graffiti have overflowed the bounds of propriety, and at many institutions become part of campus life. In

classrooms. In dorms. At sporting events. In casual conversation.

This trend is disturbing because campuses mirror society. Forty years ago, when school policies discriminated against African Americans, it was not coincidental that some states had poll taxes and literacy tests and *de jure* segregation.

Today's campus bigotry reflects the larger society as well, with all its injustices and racial, ethnic, sexist, religious, homophobic, and class tensions. Overtly hateful incidents, groups, and individuals in power, while still a minor phenomenon, are on the rise. Howard Beach. Skinheads. Bensonhurst. David Duke.

Colleges attract our brightest youngsters. If our young people finish their educations without learning to respect each other's differences and to cherish their own backgrounds, then the future will be a troubled one. Our leaders-to-be will be bigots or, perhaps more disturbing, people who tolerate a bigoted society.

IS BIGOTRY ON CAMPUS REALLY INCREASING?

There are more reported incidents of bigotry on campus today than in the past.

The Baltimore-based National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence (NIAPV) has collected newspaper clippings on campus bias incidents since 1986. Their files now fill two legal-sized drawers, and represent more than 400 incidents -- over 75 of which occurred in the first six months of 1989 alone.

Jeffrey Ross of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) has noted that in 1988 there was "a 271 percent increase in the number of campuses reporting incidents [of anti-Semitism]." That trend continues. ADL documented "69 anti-Semitic incidents on 51 college campuses in 1989 as against 54 incidents on 38 campuses the previous year."

Are incidents happening more frequently, or are they simply being reported more often? The experts think both. There are more incidents. The attention given to the problem also promotes reporting. Students see others telling authorities about incidents, and think that something may be done.

AJC's analysis of the clipping files supports the experts' opinions. The first reported incident of bigotry on any campus is probably the tenth, twentieth, or hundredth that occurred. It is simply the first to be noted in newspapers. Other reported acts of bigotry frequently follow, often creating a crisis atmosphere.

WHY IS THERE AN INCREASE OF BIGOTRY ON CAMPUS?

There are no easy or complete answers, only many complex and partial ones.

"We have a difference in terms of the national climate that existed in the 1960s," said Dr. Reginald Wilson, senior scholar at the American Council of Education, when he testified before the United States Civil Rights Commission's Campus Bigotry Subcommittee on May 18, 1989. "There was a positive climate; there was a positive sense of enforcement," he said, asserting that such a "positive climate" is lacking now.

Some experts disagree with Wilson's assessment of the current social climate. Yet few would

disagree that a large part of American society perceives a decreased commitment to civil rights and equal opportunity. That perception has had an effect on college campuses.

First, as Wilson pointed out, in "1975 there were 1,213 doctorates awarded to black Americans. In 1987 there were 725." Universities are generating fewer role models for minority students. Role models are important. Minority students who see minorities as janitors and not as professors are likely to feel less welcome on campus, tolerated rather than wanted. White students will not have their stereotypes about minorities challenged. Tension escalates.

Second, because civil rights is no longer perceived to be a national priority, bigotry is not deemed an important issue on many campuses. Many universities, lacking a commitment to studying and countering bias, see ethnic and racial explosions as public-relations problems rather than human-relations problems, and act accordingly.

The third effect of the "climatic change" may be the most important. Students have no personal knowledge of the history of racial bigotry in this country. A freshman who turns 18 years old in 1990 was born in 1972, and was 8 in 1980. He or she never saw the legally mandated Southern segregation of the 1960s and before. The "civil rights movement" is part of that student's personal prehistory, mixed into a disconnected historical reservoir along with World War II, hula hoops, and life before computers, microwaves or Velcro.[1]

It was hard enough for white students in the early 1970s -- who watched Bull Connors's dogs and fire hoses, and Lester Maddox with his ax handle -- to understand why minority classmates needed special consideration to undo the effects of discrimination.

How is today's white student -- or tomorrow's white student, in a campus with increasing minority presence -- to understand?

He or she will not be able to without help. Universities are doing little to address how many white students feel when they see their minority classmates enjoying some seemingly *deus ex machina* advantage. "I have to work two jobs, while some minority student with worse grades has a scholarship!" some students complain. Not surprisingly, many of the campus incidents reflect this resentment (e.g., a cartoon in the UCLA *Daily Bruin* showed a rooster answering "Affirmative action" to an inquiry of how he was admitted to UCLA).

Many minority students -- both those who were admitted through affirmative action and those who weren't -- also suffer from this lack of historical understanding. They know they belong on campus -- that they, like all their classmates, are capable of improving their minds and futures through a college education. Yet they perceive white students and faculty thinking: "This nonwhite person is not smart enough to be here -- he or she got in through affirmative action." And, if their relative academic preparation pales in comparison to that of their white, wealthier classmates, they may lament: "I have to work ten times as hard as a white student to get the same grades."

Asian students are subjected to similar prejudices, but with "reverse English." "They don't have to work at it -- it comes naturally to them," many other students say. Asian and Pacific rim

---

[1] "Postees" is a new term that defines this group. They are post-holocaust, post-civil rights movement, post-sexual revolution, post-feminist, etc.

A good example of historical ignorance occurred at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. The Ku Klux Klan announced a march through town. Many white students, knowing nothing about the KKK, wanted to "join the parade" and "party hearty."

students subjected to this stereotype feel that their hard work is somehow viewed as invalid. The stereotype is an excuse to "cast them off to the side." Those Asians who are "just regular" students also suffer -- performance that would be acceptable from others is considered inadequate from them.

Prejudice on campus is related to the fact that students are coming to college less prepared to accept people of different backgrounds.

Speaking at Dartmouth College, Dr. Wilson noted that inner-city public schools have a majority of minorities, while "it is increasingly possible now for white students to attend kindergarten through grade 12 [in suburbia] without seeing any black students."

There is a vast difference between an African American student growing up in the south Bronx and a white student growing up in Missoula, Montana. Each will have unexamined prejudices about the other. Even if these prejudices are not malicious, they still add to the climate of bigotry. For example, Dr. Thomas Short, associate professor of philosophy at Kenyon College, told the U.S. Civil Rights Commission about a "white girl [who] with the best of intentions asked a black girl to join a singing group. The latter replied that she couldn't sing. . . 'But I though all you people could sing,' the white girl replied, genuinely surprised."

Add to these divisions the factor of class. What are the tensions that develop as inner-city freshmen from poor African American families try to adjust to a predominantly white middle class campus? How do disadvantaged students survive in an atmosphere where status may be defined by unfamiliar and unaffordable material possessions?

The common thread through most of the clippings in the NIAPV files is the background of ignorance and insensitivity in which the explosions seem to occur. It may be in the tenth article in the third week of a crisis, but at some point, someone mentions -- and others confirm -- the everyday bigotry and insensitivity level. The bias people are used to is frequently ignored because it is the norm.

In more than one institution, an incident began with the word "nigger" scrawled onto an African American Student Association poster. But the African American students heard the word used on campus many times before, and believed that the university didn't care because it never made the every-day bigotry an issue.

"What are you going to do when someone calls you a nigger?" Michael Berry, an African American third-year Berkeley law student asked rhetorically, "Go to the police?" Such frustration was not created in a void.

How welcome can a minority student feel if all the cheerleaders are white, or if almost all minority students are athletes, or if you, and not your white classmates, are stopped by campus security?

How welcome can you feel, as a Jewish student, if the school newspaper claims Zionism is racism and compares present-day Israel to Nazi Germany? (At the University of Michigan, such newspaper articles were followed by graffiti with large red swastikas and the words "Kill all Jews.")

How welcome can you feel, as a gay person, if university officials say homophobic things, or as a woman, if male professors call you "dearie," or as an Asian American student, if you feel the university's admissions policies discriminate against you, or as a Native American student if the dancing mascot, instead of a clown or an extinct animal, is a chief?

How welcome can any student feel if the university explains how to complain when a dorm has a leaky faucet, or the meal service is inadequate, but not when a member of the faculty or staff does or says something bigoted?[2]

Percolating, unaddressed bigotry is present on most campuses that have had reported incidents of hate. Although there has been no study to prove it, the levels of intolerance seem higher at larger campuses. Many of these have increased minority enrollment over the last decade but have done little to meet the needs of minority students or help white students see minority students as full members of the campus family. Bigotry grows where students perceive themselves as members of groups fighting other groups for ever-shrinking resources.

Yet, it may be overly harsh to blame the universities for failing to meet the challenge of societal changes. Dr. Wilson is right in pointing to the problems in the larger society. The elementary and high schools have not succeeded, lacking any comprehensive mission to teach values and interpersonal relations. Certainly, learning how to live without hurting or killing one another is as important an acquired skill as the ability to read, write, or think.

Some students will come to campus with bigoted or intolerant attitudes. Knowing this, the universities must strive to make every student feel welcome. Students need an environment free from the abrasive disruption of bigotry in which to study. Colleges must adopt programs and plans to make their community as bias-free as possible. And as leaders in the educational field, they should direct changes in the high school and elementary school programs, so that their future students are better prepared to live peaceably with each other.

RESPONSES: AN OVERVIEW

Many universities assume they will never have to respond to an incideny of bigotry. An incident occurs, then administration officials wonder what they should do. NIAPV's clippings demonstrate that it is a rare *ad hoc* response that is effective. Most make a difficult situation worse.

Crises are unexpected. There is a racial assault. One morning the Jewish student center suddenly has a red, dripping swastika. A board of trustee member, or a faculty member, uses a racial slur.

Assume, as has happened, that a professor called a student a "black bitch." Students are angry, and want action. Yet, which administration member has prime responsibility to act? That may not be certain. A decision takes time. What happened may not be clear. Facts need to be found. Conflicting accounts need to be weighed, and reconciled where possible. People's reputations can be destroyed. The alleged bigot may be a colleague, a friend. The tension grows.

The administration-official-now-designated-in-charge wants any response to be completely accurate and fair.

Two days have passed. The students don't understand the deliberative process. All they know is that some bigoted sexist called one of his students a "black bitch," and the administration hasn't said a word. The university, apparently, doesn't care. How could it? It never did anything about the everyday low-visibility bigotry that students endure.

---

[2] Reporting bigotry is a frightening act -- especially if about faculty or staff. Many students agonize over what, for them, is a dilemma that can affect grades and their relationship with peers and other faculty members.

"Look at how few minority faculty members there are," students will point out, "how few blacks are incorporated into the curriculum, as if no black person ever contributed to art or literature or science. . . "

A wide range of unredressed ills will be thrown onto the stage, not as something important to be discussed rationally, and planned with a long-term perspective, but as demands in the midst of a tension-filled, media-monitored eruption.

Two words from one mouth have paralyzed an entire campus.

To avoid this chaos, universities must have two types of plan.

First, they need a response plan. Basic decisions about what to do, and who should do it, should be made before a crisis erupts. Once an incident occurs, the response will be quicker, and more effective.

Second, universities must have a plan to reduce the level of bigotry on campus, not only so there will be fewer and less explosive incidents of bigotry, but also because students deserve an environment that makes them feel welcome.

RESPONDING TO INCIDENTS: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

As any administration official who has had to do it can attest, responding to an incident is a complex affair. Passions are high, and each incident has a new wrinkle not previously thought through. The institution's view of itself and its commitment to free speech are challenged.

Yet, much can be distilled from the hundreds of distinct incidents that have occurred. Some principles are specific to types of incidents -- e.g., graffiti, slurs, speakers, assaults. But the most important lessons apply regardless of the particular circumstances.

The most important rule is the simplest to effectuate. When an incident occurs, the university, at its highest level, must respond immediately and strongly. Presidents must make themselves as public as possible, and say -- in the most powerful words -- that bigotry has no place on campus. Period.

Failure to act quickly with a clear statement will create an escalating crisis. Wishy-washy, delayed, or low-level pronouncements say that bigotry is not a serious problem, that the hurt students feel is somehow invalid. That invites further, and longer-lasting explosions.[3]

Sometimes the facts are known, and action can be taken quickly, for example when a student assaults someone while yelling ethnic slurs. If that student can be suspended immediately, before a hearing, he or she should be. But even if disciplinary codes do not provide for prehearing suspensions; even if the facts justifying such action are not apparent; or even if the perpetrator is unknown or beyond the scope of the disciplinary code (e.g., faculty, staff or from outside the campus family) immediate, visible, clear action by the head of the institution is still possible, and necessary.

---

[3] Once the campus explodes, all the forces that can exacerbate the problem are not under the university's control. Media can whip up passions. Community groups that identify with an incident can make an assault into an internationally reported affair. (Consider the attack on Jewish Brooklyn College students in the fall of 1989, which occurred in a community where the memory of the Holocaust was especially vivid.)

The president's statement should be transcribed and disseminated throughout the community, and where appropriate, mailed to parents and alumni/ae as well.

Second, a predesignated, well-rehearsed "bigotry" team should meet immediately. This team should include the university president, appropriate deans, campus security, and representatives from students and faculty. The group can better assess the incident, and plan appropriate action. For example, if a culprit has not been found, the team can mobilize the campus. The president can announce an award for information resulting in apprehension.

Other responses can be preplanned as well.

Regardless of the nature of the incident, rumors abound. A hotline should be in place, so that there is one central controlled source of information. (Hotlines also allow people to know where to report incidents, and encourage reporting of incidents that, but for an easily understood reporting mechanism, would be suffered in silence.)

If the incident is serious, students are likely to protest. The university president should call a rally, before the students do. The entire community should be invited. A presidentially instigated rally will diffuse anger, and make students perceive a real commitment to their security.

Other prepared responses can be crafted for the particular community, given its size, location, population, and history. The purpose is always to remind the victimized students that they are truly wanted, and that bigotry has no place on campus.

To make these actions work, however, they have to be sincere. Public statements have risks. When presidents of universities speak, newspaper articles follow. The school's reputation for harmony may be tarnished. Minority students, whom the university are trying to attract, may be less inclined to attend if they know that KKK literature was distributed, or an African American student was beaten up and called "nigger."

Yet the short-term risks from drawing attention to incidents will pay off in the long run. The university will benefit from strong stances which end the crisis quicker. Prospective students will know that the administration really cares.

GRAFFITI

Racist graffiti have always been part of college life. Now, however, graffiti may be a reflection of a more serious problem, and should be dealt with in new ways.

Certainly, a swastika or a "Die Jews" or a "Kill Fags" or a "Whites Only" or a "Women Are Good For Only One Thing" scribble should not be left up. As with other forms of graffiti, swift removal is a deterrent to additional applications.[4]

Painting over the offense is not enough. Acts of bigotry should be used as opportunities to educate, and to demoralize those who spew hate.

---

[4] "Minor" graffiti -- such as slurs carved into or written onto library carrels -- should be removed as often as possible. A big swastika may draw everyone's attention, but the small ones also injure.

Jeffrey Ross of the ADL has suggested that schools replace older wooden desks with "graffiti-resistant furniture, that can be easily washed."

Rather than having the maintenance staff remove the graffito, a group representing all segments of the college community (which need not be the "bigotry response" team) should pass the paint or scrub brush, taking turns removing the scribble. This simple act will reaffirm the victimized students' sense that they are wanted members of the campus family.

If the graffito is placed in a dorm (or if an assault occurs in a dorm) members of the group could spend the night there, making the affected students feel more secure. Four deans held an overnight "dean watch" at Brown University, to good effect.

PHYSICAL VIOLENCE AND ITS VICTIMS

A university's commitment to "free speech" complicates the desire to discipline students who engage in bigotry. Universities work best when students and faculty feel free to say whatever they think. Whereas students should be aware that their words can hurt others, they should not be forced to weigh their thoughts against administration-imposed limits of political correctness. Higher education is at its best when the clash between ideas is heated, not chilled.

But bigotry many times manifests itself through a sanctionable act. Free speech issues diminish, and acts can be punished promptly and forcefully.

If a student commits an assault, burglary, arson, or other serious offense, and the disciplinary code allows for summary suspension, and the known facts warrant it, the student should be suspended immediately, pending a hearing.

If there are questions about what happened, or who did what, summary suspension should not be used, regardless of any pressure to do so. The response to critics who call for immediate suspension is to have a realistic "fast track" disciplinary hearing procedure established, so that a full due process hearing can be held quickly -- in less than a week.

While the university cannot punish bigoted thoughts or words, it can punish bigoted behavior. As in the larger society, acts which are already circumscribed by law can and should be punished more severely if committed with a bigoted motive.

Punishment must be fair. When there are many students involved, each should be disciplined according to the seriousness of his or her act and prior history. Other factors that can inflame a campus -- such as treating the star athlete differently from others -- should be rejected, despite institutional pressure.

Schools have a real interest in separating people who commit violent acts from their community, especially when the acts are against gays or women or Jews or African Americans or Asians or Indians or anyone else just because of who they are. Swift clear action can be a deterrent, and reaffirm the school's commitment to make the victimized group truly welcome.

But that is only half the task.

Regardless of what the administration does, the student who has been traumatized still hurts.

As one Brown University student said, "I have never in my life felt threatened, and now I'm having nightmares."

The effects of a bias assault -- whether physical or verbal -- are devastating. Fear is engendered

"far beyond what the average person would imagine," according to Joan Weiss, executive director of the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence.

The trauma is long lasting, and frequently effects family, friends, the entire campus and sometimes the community beyond.

"It used to be that you could walk on campus and not be conscious of whether or not you were in an elevator with whites or blacks," said a Columbia student. "Now you wonder what they're thinking."

Some victims even abandon their college plans and leave.

Others are too afraid to report incidents, fearing a backlash that could jeopardize their education. "You want to blend in and not always stand out," said one Bridgewater State student.

Universities must help victims recover. A specially trained victims' advocate should be available to counsel students, and direct them to therapists and lawyers[5] where appropriate. The advocate can also help shape the university's plans and institutions to meet the needs of bias victims. Otherwise, victims feel increasingly isolated, bouncing from one unprepared campus service to another without receiving any help.

CODES

Acts of bigotry, even when not physically violent, are psychologically distressing. Ethnic slurs, whether yelled, painted on a sign, or printed in a leaflet, are emotional assaults. People have their identity and self-worth shattered. Bigotry injures. Everyone wants justice. Someone should be punished.

Some universities seem to think that all their bigotry problems can be solved through strong disciplinary codes.[6] In theory, offenders are punished, and would-be offenders are deterred. However, institutions that see codes as "magic cures" are deceiving themselves.

First, many bigots are not caught. As one Berkeley student said, "If I call you a name to your face or do damage to your person or your property, then it's easy to pursue someone. But if in the dark of night I throw a stone through your window and vanish, then how do you pursue the culprit?"

Second, even if found, the person may be beyond the disciplinary code. Faculty members and university officials are subject to different standards. Outsiders, like Ku Klux Klan members who paint swastikas and Skinheads who beat up gay students, are also beyond the code's jurisdiction.

Third, rules that punish assault, arson, vandalism, burglary, harassment, threats or intimidation are effective on their own. Codes need not be changed to punish bigots who hit or burn or burgle

---

[5] Students may be able to sue bigots for libel, slander, violation of civil rights, assault, battery, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. These suits may act as a deterrent against the defendant, because of the prospect of money damages.

[6] Codes are rules of conduct for students, defining expected behavior, and the procedures by which transgressions are punished. They are, in effect, the criminal law of the college. Private institutions have fewer restrictions on their codes than public ones, which are controlled by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. These minimal distinctions will not be treated here, because we are more concerned with what institutions should do than with what they are obliged to do.

or harass.[7]

When universities speak of codes against bigotry, they mean regulations to proscribe students from what is, essentially, verbal or symbolic expression.

The arguments in favor of such codes are attractive at first blush. What better way to demonstrate that the institution will not tolerate bigotry?[8] If the school can punish a person who spray paints the word "nigger" on the wall of a predominately African American dorm in the middle of the night (that is vandalism), why shouldn't it be able to punish another student who, in broad daylight, walks up to a particular African American student and yells "I hate niggers!"

Certainly, the hurt caused by that personally directed scream exceeds that resulting from the written slur.

One suggested rationalization for punishing the vandal but not the screamer is that the school has an interest in knowing who its bigots are. But this rationale fails when the comparison is between a spray-painted swastika and one drawn on paper and taped to the dorm wall. The harm is practically the same, but the former, as destruction of property, can result in expulsion, while the latter may be protected speech.

That result seems, and is, unsatisfactory. Yet it is better to draw the line here -- between action that is punishable regardless of its bigoted character and action that is not punishable precisely because it has no character beyond being an expression of bigotry.

Justice cannot always be found in laws. Laws are imperfect. Results may be unsatisfactory, but it is nonetheless true that attempts to punish the expression of words simply don't work. Codes designed to outlaw bigotry, such as the University of Michigan's[9] and the University of

---

[7] Most universities have policies regulating student conduct. The University of Alabama, for example, has rules, among other things, against alcohol, drugs, firearms, theft, damage of property, gambling, hazing, false alarms, unauthorized entry on or use of school property, and flagrant parking violations. The rules also prescribe "actions" against "persons or groups," including "physical abuse or threat of abuse . . . disorderly conduct . . . conduct dangerous to the health and safety of any person . . . indecent or obscene conduct or expression . . . harassment." These last rules may be overly broad or vague, although they apparently were not designed to proscribe speech.

The University of California at Berkeley has Student Misconduct residence regulations, and rules against dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism), forgery, theft, unauthorized entry to or use of school property, obstruction or destruction of university activities, physical abuse, threats of violence, conduct that threatens health and safety, disorderly or lewd conduct, unlawful assembly and illegal drugs.

An act committed with a bigoted motive can, of course, be punished more severely than a "simple" transgression under existing codes.

[8] The deterrent effect is questionable if no one knows what the code says. Joseph Kowalsky noted in the January 5, 1990 issue of *Sh'ma*, "When I picked [up a copy of the University of Michigan Code Against Discrimination] I asked if it was distributed to students. . . . They did not know. That office did not do it. I checked with the Office of the President. They did not distribute it. I checked with the Registrar's Office. They did not distribute it. I checked with the Student Orientation Office. They did not distribute it. . . . I spoke with several undergraduates . . . A few knew that the thing existed. Several assumed that some such thing existed. None had read it."

[9] The University of Michigan's policy outlawed "Any behavior, verbal or physical, that stigmatizes or victimizes an individual on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, handicap or Vietnam-era veteran status and that

"a. Involves an express or implied threat to an individual's academic efforts, employment, participation in University sponsored extracurricular activities or personal safety; or

"b. Has the purpose or reasonably foreseeable effect of interfering with an individual's academic efforts . . . ."

Judge Cohn, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, ruled the code "overbroad" because it "sweeps within its ambit a substantial amount of protected speech," such as when a complaint was lodged against a student who stated "in a class discussion his belief that homosexuality was a disease." The judge also found the rule unconstitutionally

Connecticut's, have been found violative of the First Amendment. No lawyer can draft language precise enough to punish the person who says "nigger" only when he or she *really* means it.

Attempts at broad codes have backfired. Students at the University of Michigan -- which adopted different standards of speech for the classroom, dorm, etc. -- had a grand time making fun of the entire effort with "free speech zones" written in broad chalk strokes around the campus. What is the deterrent effect of that ridiculed rule? And what is the deterrent effect of any code when acts of bigotry are likely to be spontaneous, frequently committed under the influence of alcohol? No drunk about to yell "Nigger!" at a passing African American student weighs his words against the finely drawn limits of a disciplinary code.

Egregious use of hateful words can be punished under most existing codes that proscribe harassment, intimidation or threats of violence. Codes that would punish a student who repeatedly calls another at 3:00 a.m. and says, "I hate your mother" would also punish a student whose harassing phone calls are racist. Codes that prohibit one student from threatening and intimidating another (e.g., "You go out with Peggy Sue again and I'll slash your face, you asshole!") also apply when the student warned to stay away from Peggy Sue is called a "fucking Jew asshole."

Even narrowly drawn antibigotry codes tarnish the schools' reputation for academic freedom and open inquiry. Punishing a student for using bigoted words or printing bigoted articles drapes the bigot, instead of the school, in the First Amendment. The bigot becomes the victim, even a martyr, as the real victim disappears, a casualty of a fight that has become one for free speech instead of against bigotry.

The practical limits of codes are difficult to accept. Some people who should be disciplined will not be.[10] But the university will benefit from a narrow code. A student's suspension for writing "Gays should die of AIDS," or "I kill Jews therefore I am," or "Puerto Ricans are scum" cannot outweigh the damage of months of disruption, legal proceedings, and constitutional debate that continue to open wounds. There are other ways to respond to such cases.

As for codes, while no perfect definitional line can be drawn, a functional pretty-bright-lined code that punishes action and not words is preferable to an unacceptably fuzzy one that tries to legislate morality. If the campus develops a real commitment to fighting bigotry, community ostracism of the bigot will be punishment enough.

SPEAKERS

Outside speakers with reputations for bigotry who come to campus, and then leave, often create traumatic moments that take years to undo. The problem is not as much what the speaker says (usually the address is tamer than people expect) but the tension that precedes and follows the

---

vague because the words "stigmatize" and "victimize" "are general and elude precise definition." Vague rules violate the First Amendment because no one knows for certain what conduct is prohibited.

Other new rules may have the same infirmity. As of November 1, 1989, the University of California at Berkeley was debating a "Policy on Student Racial Harassment" which outlaws "fighting words," defined as "personally abusive epithets" which are "likely to provoke a violent reaction."

The University of Wisconsin has adopted a policy which outlaws "discriminatory comments, epithets or other expressive behavior . . . [which demeans] the race, sex, religion, color, creed, disability, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry or age of the individual or individuals [and creates] an intimidating, hostile or demeaning environment for . . . university-authorized activity."

[10] However, since a code creates an expectation that incidents will be responded to through a disciplinary process, codes may deter the development of other, more creative approaches.

event.

Universities are places for open inquiry. No idea should be barred. On most campuses, student groups and faculty members have the absolute right to invite anyone they want.

What happens when someone invites a member of the Ku Klux Klan, or Minister Louis Farrakhan -- who peppers his words of African American political action with gross anti-Semitism (Judaism is a "gutter religion") -- or Meir Kahane, whose views on Arabs is akin to Farrakhan's on Jews or the KKK's on African Americans?

The students who are the targets of the speaker's hatred feel insecure, misunderstood, and powerless. The protestation that "we want to hear about the good things [the speaker] has done," or "everyone has a right to speak -- ask him questions and expose him, if you can" are wholly inadequate. "Why should our student fees be used to bring someone here who would kill us if he could?" some ask.

The greatest pain for the students who feel unfairly maligned may be that their fellow classmates cannot -- or will not -- understand why they feel so hurt. Lines are drawn and victimized students react angrily, in protest if they are strong enough numerically, in silence if they are too few.

The inviting group also feels misunderstood. African American students who invite Farrakhan can't comprehend why Jewish groups are so upset. Farrakhan speaks strongly for empowering African Americans. "Can it be that the Jewish students are afraid of such a strong leader?" they may ask themselves. "So what if Farrakhan said some nasty things. That's not important. His message of power for African American people is. Who are they to tell us we can't listen to him, anyway?"

Administration officials -- committed to free speech -- are caught in the middle between two polarized campus groups that desire punishment, even victory. It is not easy to hold the community together as the conflict heats up. Sometimes the cost of additional security is prohibitive, and the speaker does not come. But usually he or she does, and the campus is paralyzed in anticipation of what may happen.

The group opposed to the speaker may protest, and seek faculty and community support for their own exercise of First Amendment rights.

Officials may fear hecklers. Many times speakers cannot be heard over screams. Infringing on other students' free speech rights may violate disciplinary rules.

The administration's priorities in the weeks before and after the crisis peaks should be twofold. The commitment to free speech must be ironclad; and so too must be the commitment to intergroup sensitivity. While the tension between these two principles cannot be eliminated, it can be reduced with planning.

The ideal -- but nonexistent -- campus is one where every student would be sensitive to the hurt his or her actions and words cause another. Students who would want to bring a speaker would then wonder whether that person would cause pain to other students, and if so, decide to bring someone else to campus instead.

That caring community is the goal. On campuses where the polarization is not extreme, the administration might invite student groups to submit the names of contemplated speakers to each

other before an invitation is extended. Such a procedure would be voluntary, and, regardless of any opposition, the right to invite speakers would remain inviolate.

A voluntary preinvitation notice to other groups would allow discussion and decision before "saving face" issues, such as how to uninvite an invited speaker, come into play.

Jewish students, for example, can let African American students know why having Farrakhan on campus is hurtful. The point might be made at a meeting (coordinated by an intergroup professional) with role plays, transposing Farrakhan's words, substituting "African American" for "Jew," so that the African American students can better understand the hurt. And Jewish students could begin to understand the isolation African American students feel on a white campus with white values -- and why an African American speaker who talks of power is important to them.

A process like this one can be helpful -- especially if it allows the students to see each other as individual human beings. But it will only work if run by people who know what they are doing and if the students are committed to it. Otherwise, it could become an easy process to manipulate -- for example, Arab students objecting to every Jewish speaker.

If a faculty member wants to invite a speaker, the issue is more complex. While he or she has the absolute right to invite anyone, the professor should also be sensitive to the hurt an invitation may cause. At the University of Kansas, for example, the furor over an invitation to members of the Ku Klux Klan was partly diffused when the faculty member (who wanted to teach his journalism students how to expose bigots with interview skills) agreed to hold that class off campus.

Even with the implementation of procedures to make people more sensitive to others' feelings, controversial speakers will still come to campus -- as they should. The administration must insure that students pro and con can exercise their First Amendment rights with minimal interference.

Hecklers should not be allowed, but protests should be accommodated. Innovative protests that show respect for fellow students should be encouraged.

At Oberlin, for example, Jewish students protested an anti-Semitic African American speaker silently. They attended the speech, sitting patiently in their white T-shirts with the Star of David on the back. At the speaker's his first anti-Semitic words, the students stood and turned their backs to the stage. Their silent protest was dramatic and effective. Other people in the audience stood and joined them in sympathy.

CAMPUS SECURITY AND OTHER "FRONT LINE" STAFF

The campus police forces are frequently a source of tension on campus. Sometimes they instigate incidents.[11] Frequently, they exacerbate them.

In many universities male minority students complain that campus police officials are more likely to stop and question them than whites or women. Sometimes campus police use racial slurs, and false detention cases (e.g., presuming the African American student in an interracial brawl is

---

[11] For example, an African American student filed a lawsuit against Duke University after an officer allegedly yelled "Hey boy!" and then arrested the student when he threatened to file a complaint, and tried to leave. The university settled the suit.

the culprit) have resulted in lawsuits.

One problem is that many low-paid campus security guards bring with them bigoted attitudes exacerbated by economic resentment.[12]

Administrators, or the agencies with whom they contract, should try to weed out bigots before they are hired. Guidelines for relating to[13] and detaining students should be clear, and the color-blindness of the rules reasserted.

Campus security guards can be screened and educated to act more sensitively. They should know that swastikas and racial and sexual assaults are not pranks, be able to insure that no evidence is destroyed, and make sure that the victim is treated with sympathy.

Larger universities should have one better-trained and higher-paid special campus security team on duty, or on call, at all times. This group should be trained to respond to every type of bias incident. It can soothe the victims and help prevent incidents from turning into riots. Also, the presence of a better-paid antibias group provides the regular security guards with an option for advancement. If they want this better job, they know they have to be sensitive to all students to get it.[14]

It is not only those university employees who come into contact with bias victims who need good intergroup skills. All staff need it. Tensions spread in quiet ways. An African American students feel it when a secretary gives disapproving looks at new "afro" styles, or a Jewish student with a yarmulke is stared at.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS EXPERTS

During and after an explosion of bigotry, the campus is in turmoil. Emotions and anger run high. Rational thought is sometimes difficult.

Students forced to confront ethnic conflict and other potentially divisive issues can react defensively and lash out, or withdraw. There are practitioners in the field of intergroup relations who go to campuses and cultivate ethnic pride and understanding. They also help the university community develop structures and procedures for managing diversity. AJC's Institute for American Pluralism, headed by Irving Levine[15] and Joe Giordano, and Cherie Brown's National Coalition Building Institute are but two of many. These groups provide valuable assistance to campuses even in the "calm" times. Certainly, they should be contacted before, and invited to campus after, any incident of bigotry.[16]

---

[12] Security on many public campuses is the responsibility of public employees, such as state police. Training for these officers should be provided in police academies. The campus should provide additional intergroup training if needed.

[13] On some campuses male security guards have been known to treat women students in a sexist manner.

[14] Of course, the existence of a better-trained campus security squad should not be used as an excuse to train the "regular" forces inadequately.

[15] Irving Levine's "soft, nonconfrontational approach" has three goals. First, to empower the campus to fight all forms of bigotry. Second, to enhance a healthy group identity. And third, to depoliticize and professionalize the issues, so that even the most radical students, who "don't think the campus recognizes its cultural norms, will buy into the mainstream when their radical vision is provided a vent."

[16] Some universities are beginning to rely on their own intergroup relations experts. Certainly, campus counseling services should have bigotry management as part of their portfolio.

However, intergroup professionals should not be used as an excuse to overlook other changes needed to promote good

Specialists like Joe Giordano also train faculty members to manage difficult situations in their classrooms -- a dynamic that nothing in their education has prepared them for. Even faculty members who know what to do when a student utters a blatantly prejudiced remark may have no idea what to do when student A says something from which student B infers a hidden prejudiced agenda. And few faculty members are adept at countering the overt sexism that one New York-based history professor terms "pervasive in relations between males and females in every course he teaches." Irving Levine offers a workshop for dealing with racial, ethnic, religious, gender-based and homophobic slurs that "takes hours with faculty, plotting and planning what you say, what you don't say, how you handle it, what has worked, what hasn't worked, what in your own personal view makes you reticent to confront it directly, where that originates from, when you back off, when you open up . . ."

STUDENTS AND FACULTY

The university president must encourage students and faculty to develop their own antibigotry institutions. Antibias student groups can distribute antiracist literature and buttons (such as one with a slash through the encircled word "bias"), organize rallies, empower victims, initiate discussion, and form coalitions with students on other campuses. The more involved students are in developing their own programs, the better they will succeed.

Faculty groups can lend intellectual credibility to the fight against bias. Professors can teach about bigotry both in their classes and at specially designed forums, including freshman orientation. They can also preplan ways to exploit incidents for their educational value.

RESPONSE PLANNING OVERVIEW

There is much that can be planned before the onset of the unpredictable but inevitable crisis. The suggestions given here are certainly not all the possible responses. Experience, experimentation, and changing personnel and circumstances will dictate the details of any particular response plan.

Hotlines, response teams, training, a "fast track" for disciplinary cases, improving campus security and many other practical things can be done so that the administration doesn't grope, or give the impression of negligence or insensitivity.

The most important thing, however, is that university presidents articulate a commitment to creating a campus community with zero tolerance for bigotry. This commitment should be communicated not only after an incident but also at calmer times. It must be demonstrated with actions -- actions that build structures so that the campus community can manage conflict better. And the commitment must include another plan, one not for responding to bigotry but for reducing it.

PLANNED BIGOTRY REDUCTION

Ask students about their experiences with bigotry on campus, and their answers will not be about the splashy headlines of the explosions.

"Racial tension is definitely there," a Harvard student said. "[T]here's definite racial ignorance

---

intergroup relations. Experts help; they cannot substitute for a real commitment to or viable structures for managing diversity.

that comes out in people's conversations and definite nuances in how the university handles the situation."

"No longer will Brown be a place where I pay $20,000 a year to be called a 'nigger,'" a Brown student exclaimed.

"A friend of mine was the only black student in his class and they had to form groups to work on case studies," another student explained. "No one in the class picked him and no one picked the other minority student in the class, an Asian girl. They ended up having to work together."

"In my 20th-century history class we are up to the 1960s right now, and for our final we have to watch a movie dealing with 20th-century history and write a movie review of it," an Eastern Michigan University student said. "We were given a list of movies to choose from and not one was about black people -- like *Roots* or *The Color Purple* or a movie on Harriet Tubman or *Mississippi Burning*. The teacher's movies were *Tucker* and *American Dream*. I don't know how we got through 20th-century history without talking about black people."

"Students are tipped off about a General Union of Palestine Students' sponsored resolution condemning Israel," Lisa Baron Haet, the Northern California Jewish Community Campus Advisor wrote. "The tip comes from a Jewish student active in student government. The resolution passes. Zionist students, labeled as racists, are effectively shut out of the government process. The tipster makes no move to oppose the resolution. He is too afraid to reveal openly that he is a Jew."

At campuses where the administration has committed itself to fighting bigotry in all its manifestations students are more likely to feel at home, part of the family.

Where bigotry reduction is not a long-range priority, students have harsh words for the administration. One Hampshire student described the administration as "hand-shakers. If you don't press them then they'll sweep it under the rug."

Bigotry exists in all segments of society, and it appears in all parts of a campus community, sometimes subtly.

A faculty member may call on only the male students, or the white students, for answers to difficult questions.

A textbook may analyze African tribes by Western standards -- if they are tall and clean limbed they are attractive and intelligent, if they are stubby they are deformed.

Women at a newly coed school -- still over 90 percent female -- may elect men to three of the top four student leadership posts, and then complain about "male students taking over."

To make all students feel secure, attitudes have to be changed -- not just those of the spray-paint crowd. And for the changes to work well, the changes should not be seen only as necessary steps to reduce the risk of an "incident," but as positive steps that add to the vibrancy of education and to the quality of life on campus.

BIGOTRY SURVEY

No realistic plan to counter bigotry on campus can be crafted without first assessing the problem.

Forums should be held to alert faculty, administration, staff, and students that a full-scale self-examination is a campus priority. Everyone should know that all incidents are to be reported, so that the community can better gauge its bigotry level. The mechanism for reporting incidents (e.g., a hotline) should be explained. The experiences of other campuses should be studied.[17]

Students and faculty, along with experts, should design questionnaires going to every part of campus life. Do people hear slurs? From whom? How often? Do they fear retribution if they challenge slurs? How serious is sexism on campus? Are there "exclusive men's clubs" that refuse to admit women?

Do minority students self-segregate? Is this just normal healthy attraction for people with things in common (like the football team always eating together), or is this a manifestation of survival under siege? What are the class components to the problem? Do students congregate in certain ways based on whether they can afford a car? What neighborhoods do they go home to?

Are dorm rooms assigned on the basis of race? Do minority students prefer living with people who share their experiences?

Do more expensive or newer dorm rooms cost more for students? If so, does this breed resentment?[18]

Do faculty members teach as if all knowledge derived from "dead white European males"? If so, how difficult would it be to change curriculum so that every student can see that people of his and every other background have contributed to human knowledge and history?

Has the school tried to attract a broad base of students? Of faculty? Are minority faculty limited to stereotyped roles -- e.g., African American faculty teaching African American studies -- or do they teach in broader disciplines? Do people feel that minority faculty have been denied tenure unfairly (e.g., their fields of concentration might not be appreciated by the general faculty) or granted tenure unfairly (inferior academics kept as tokens)?

Are there immigrant students and students from other countries on campus? Are they picked on because their English may be deficient?

What are the informal mechanisms for releasing tension on campus? Do casual conversations between faculty and students reduce tensions through informal counseling and advising? Do casual conversations between faculty and administrators help identify pressure points before they explode? If so, what are the implications if there are not enough minority role models in the faculty? Do administrators then not hear of problems in the minority community? Do minority students have no everyday, easy way to vent their frustration to an authority figure who can commiserate?

What do students feel about each other and themselves? Do minority students feel comfortable enough to behave naturally, or do they find themselves acting as they think white students expect them to behave? Do white students see minority students acting in "different" ways, such as playing

---

[17] Barnard students visited other campuses to study structures for countering bias and discrimination on campus. The educational nature of the visits depoliticized the issues, and allowed students from different groups to work together on a common antibias goal.

[18] The fee structures on many campuses distinguish only between single rooms and multiple rooms, and not between newer, older, larger, or "better."

different or loud music, and assume that the behavior is intended as an irritant rather than an expression of a different culture?

What manifestations of discrimination have the students witnessed, and how frequently?[19] Are they aware of bias against others?[20] If the campus is located in a predominantly white area, do other students and the administration know about bigotry expressed against minority students on public transportation, in local stores, etc.? Is date rape a problem that no one is willing to talk about?

Do people know enough about the basic assumptions under which each group operates? Does anyone even know what literature each group reads? Do minority students understand that Jewish students -- who have Holocaust-broken branches in their family tree and who are personally threatened when someone clamors about an end to Zionism -- see themselves not as part of the white power structure but as an historically vulnerable people? Do minority students understand that Jewish students are not monolithic, and frequently disagree with each other? Do white and Jewish students understand that many minority students shape their identity around "third world" literature that defines society through a prism of class struggle against oppression? Do administrators appreciate the self-fulfilling prophecy aspect of this ideology -- that those who define themselves as barred from power sometimes see themselves as excluded even when that is not the intent of a policy or action?

What do students, faculty and staff think should be done to make the climate better? Do fraternities and sororities promote sexism, homophobia, and ethnic and religious bigotry? If so, is this a manifestation of what they do, whom they attract, what they stand for, how much alcohol they consume, or some combination thereof? Should there be fraternities for gay and lesbian students, who surveys suggest are the most vilified group on campus?[21]

Is dorm life acceptable? In larger universities, do residence-hall directors reflect the ethnic and religious makeup of the dorm residents, so that students have someone they feel comfortable with with whom to discuss adjustment to college life and incidents of bigotry?

If there is housing for married students, should there be dorms for "married" gay students?

Are "new" groups that want to assert their identity on campus allowed to do so? Do the other, established groups feel threatened? Do they build a hierarchy of groups based on factors such as which is the "most oppressed," or do they see this as an opportunity for more groups to come together as allies?

Do groups know what resources the university offers to improve their environment? For

---

[19] New York's Governor's Task Force on Bias Related Violence (March 1988) found that "at a New York State campus . . . [t]hirty-one percent of the 847 student respondents reported [sexual] harassment, as did 21% of the employees."

[20] A National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence study of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County campus found that over 10 percent of sampled students were bias victims. By groups, over 20% of the blacks, 17% of the Asians, 14% of the Jews, and 5% of the whites were victims of bigoted acts.

The study also determined that student perceptions of discrimination differed. For example, 76 percent of the African American students believed they, as a group, suffered from discrimination; 52 percent of the Jewish students, 36 percent of the non-Jewish white students, and 26 percent of the Asian students agreed that African American students were discriminated against.

[21] When UCLA agreed to form a gay fraternity, one gay student commented, "Maybe we'll have pantie raids at the lesbian sorority. . . somebody's got to do it, and it might as well be us."

example, do Jewish students bombarded by anti-Semitic propaganda that proclaims Zionism racism know how to get a course offered on the history of Zionism?

Are there student, faculty and other leaders willing to stimulate the slow process of change by example?

Is there a core of institutional identity that can be cultivated (especially by the president) that defines everyone in common, the "after-all-you-are-all-Whatsamatta-U.-students" approach? Can this "myth of the institution" be used to foster an ideology of intergroup respect?

What is it that students want anyway? Is it, as Dr. Robert L. Hess, president of Brooklyn College suggests, "respect for the community from which he or she comes; their individual dignity respected; and justice in abstract terms -- beyond group interests, for example, the high ideals of the U.S. Constitution." If so, can an institutional identity help cultivate an ideology of respect for personal dignity, intergroup respect, and a thirst for justice?

These and other questions should be asked, answered, tabulated and studied. By counting incidents and charting attitudes with the help of professionals, schools can develop and evaluate long- and short-range plans to fight bigotry on campus.

IMMEDIATE ACTION

Change is a long process, best achieved when people are persuaded by example rather than fiat. A faculty member may see a suggestion to include James Baldwin in his literature class as an invasion of academic freedom. But if he or she sees others he or she respects changing their courses, and is allowed the time and access to outside help to make similar curriculum modifications, he or she may do so enthusiastically.

While some changes take time, others can be made while the university studies itself and encourages change gently.

First, every way it can, the university must make students, faculty, staff and alumni/ae know that it is committed to eradicating bigotry while upholding academic freedom and free speech. The president has to lead, but others must follow.

Symbols of bigotry must be removed. If the university sports Confederate flags, these must be taken down. No African American student could feel at home, and there are less provocative ways to honor southern history.

If the university has an Indian mascot, he must be retired. No suggestion that the mascot seeks to honor Indians as fleet-of-foot or brave-of-heart should be accepted, even if older alumni/ae are disconcerted. (Would they approve someone in a pope uniform as a mascot for a Bible study group, or someone dressed as a rabbi as a mascot for the debate team?)

In addition to creating a hotline,[22] a response team,[23] and victims assistance services,[24] specialized

---

[22] As Brown University has.

[23] As the University of Connecticut's April 5, 1989 "Report of the Subcommittee on Discriminatory Harassment to the Student Welfare Committee and the University Senate" suggests.

[24] Ibid.

training should be given to campus security and dorm monitors and anyone else likely to service victims of bigotry.

All members of the incoming freshman class should undergo intergroup training workshops as part of their orientation. Faculty, administration and staff -- including janitors, telephone operators and secretaries -- should undergo this training as well. Everyone should be encouraged and empowered to take a stand when they encounter bigotry.

Since it will take years to integrate examples of the contribution of all groups into the everyday curriculum, ethnic studies courses should be offered and promoted. Students and faculty alike should learn that people interpret their own realities differently, that there is no one perspective that necessarily defines "truth."

Teaching diversity should be an educational mission that saturates the campus.

Programs that help different student groups achieve a healthy group identity, and feel that they can have a real role in campus life, should be encouraged, as long as they are not myopic.

And programs should be developed that draw students from different backgrounds together to work on common goals.

But central to the long-term health of the community is the commitment of the college president. His or her steadfast leadership in combating bigotry must not be an end in itself -- his or her commitment must permeate the community and empower it.

The president must enlist the board of trustees to support plans for change. A long-range bigotry reduction strategy has to plan for the educational institutions of the year 2000 and beyond, not those of the years 1950 and before. Minorities will make up an ever-increasing segment of America in the next century -- a century that will require a college education for over half its work force.[25]

Our universities must teach our students how to live in the America that will be. That America will be multiethnic and multicultural, and demand citizens who understand, appreciate and respect pluralism. The institutional changes needed to meet this future must have the support of an enthusiastic and forward-looking board of trustees.

The entire institution must be energized. It is not enough that faculty and students survey themselves or begin to recognize bigotry as an "issue." That is only the first step. Chaplains, deans of students, staff, administration, faculty and students all have to become involved in the process of change. They all have to be encouraged through forums, presidential statements, and campus debate to remold the institution into one that will be stimulating, relevant, and comfortable for all its members.

These steps, by themselves, announce a university's commitment to minimize bigotry more strongly than any harsh code. These changes would not be traumatic, or challenge academic

---

[25] Even some students who may be skeptical about the need for developing good intergroup skills may respond to a message of self interest. Dr. Hess, president of Brooklyn College, tells his students "that by the time they are forty, the work place will be so ethnically diverse that the people who have good intergroup and diversity skills will be the ones who advance and succeed."

freedom. As better campus surveys and ideas appear in the years ahead, improvements can be refined, creating a *status quo* that lets all students thrive.

RESPONSIBILITY TO EFFECT CHANGE IN ALL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INCLUDING GRADE AND HIGH SCHOOLS

All these long- and short-range plans presuppose a failure, and a difficult problem that has other, easier solutions. Many students come to college bigoted or ignorant about others. They could have benefited from intergroup and values training throughout their elementary and secondary education.

Schools need to incorporate teaching about pluralism into every part of the curriculum, from kindergarten through high school. Before they come to college, students must learn to appreciate and feel comfortable with -- in fact, cherish -- their own backgrounds, and understand and respect those of their classmates. White students should learn of the contributions of African Americans, not through one-day-a-year events on Martin Luther King's birthday, but naturally -- for example, through English classes that include writings from African American authors. In elementary school history classes, students whose ancestors came through Ellis Island, or on the *Mayflower*, should be encouraged to be proud of their heritage; but they should also learn that not everyone who came to our shores on a ship did so willingly, and that there were remarkable people here before the first boat landed.

With changes like these throughout the grade school and high school curriculum, and through multicultural presentations such as the American Jewish Committee's "Ethnic Sharing" and "Hands Across the Campus" programs, students will come to college better prepared to live in a supportive multigroup community with a low bigotry level.

Universities and higher educational associations can instigate change for the next generation of students. Those that train secondary teachers should teach them how to challenge bigotry in the classroom. Few teachers begin their professional careers knowing what to do when confronted with an incident of bigotry. Some will ignore it, others will explode emotionally. Teachers need to be trained in conflict resolution techniques, so that bigotry can be challenged constructively, without any student feeling victimized.

Educational associations[26] also set tones and define agendas. University presidents should press these organizations to make bigotry reduction a key goal, and encourage them to generate long-term plans and programs.

Universities, collectively, also have the power to effect change quickly and profoundly, through their own admissions policies.

If universities (or even one university, setting the example for others) announce that training in intergroup relations and values education will be one factor considered in admitting and offering financial aid to students, the secondary schools will be more likely to offer these classes and programs right away. Certainly, participation in intergroup training should be as much of an

---

[26] For example: the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Higher Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the American Council on Education, etc. If these associations made the teaching of intergroup relations a high priority, government might follow the lead and implement needed programs in the public elementary and secondary schools.

admissions factor as whether a student participated in extracurricular activities like the chess club or the cheerleading squad.

Some colleges offer admission under open enrollment, so the added criteria would not apply as well as at private institutions. But the message would be clear -- that universities want students who know how to live with and respect each other.

High school teachers, and especially parents of high school students, would be motivated to push for these changes. Parents seek any advantage for their child's college admission or award of a scholarship.

CONCLUSION

All the ideas discussed above are designed to help universities assess and manage diversity on their campus climates as they are now, and as demographic and social changes will shape them in the years to come.

Every idea will come to nothing, however, if the president of the institution lacks the commitment to make the hard choices needed to change the campus environment.

It may seem a good gamble to avoid this troubling issue by hoping that incidents occur at other places, or if they occur at home, that the student turnover will diminish the damage over time. Such a strategy may work -- although in universities with a history of problems, some decade-old incidents have resurfaced as issues in current crises.

Whether a particular college can "get away" with avoiding the problem of bigotry is not the question. Higher education should be a liberating experience. Ideas should flow and stereotypes should be challenged in an environment where everyone is free to express and explore, knowing that faculty, staff, and students respect each other and treat each other as family.

One institution that has had no "explosions" is innovative Bard College, in Annandale-on-Hudson, New York.

One alumnus, who attended Bard during the Vietnam years, is not surprised. "No one ever took over the administration building there," he said, "although once, feeling left out in comparison to the activists on other campuses, students dismantled the president's VW Bug and reassembled it inside the administration building. But that was a sign of respect.

"Every second or third semester there was a crisis. Once some faculty members refused to cancel exams so that students could protest the mining of Haiphong harbor," he explained. "Reamer Kline -- the president -- invited everyone to the old gym. He'd always call a meeting immediately -- before the students could organize anything. I don't remember what he said, but I remember he respected everyone's point of view and made us all feel part of the community, regardless of where we stood.

"My best memory was when Kline called his last emergency meeting. It was in late 1973 or early 1974. He had announced his retirement by then. He stood underneath the basketball backboard, waited for the students to stop talking, and began by saying how much he enjoyed these meetings. He even thanked the students for them. I turned to a friend and said, 'Do you believe that? Kline actually thanked us for all the chaos!'

"For Kline, and for me, those wild moments of turmoil were the best Bard had to offer. Reamer Kline's simple 'thank you' captured the sense of community, the real love of divergent ideas, and the respect that each of us had for each other."

If university presidents make ending bigotry a priority, and have Reamer Kline's skill of using crises as educational and community-building tools, campuses should become better places for future leaders to live and learn in.

APPENDIX

Response Plan Highlights

-- President must proclaim, quickly, loudly, and firmly, that prejudice will not be tolerated.

-- Assemble the predesignated bigotry response team.

-- Consider immediate suspension, if appropriate.

-- Consider reward, if appropriate.

-- Publicize the bigotry "hotline."

-- Consider a rally or community meeting.

-- If major graffiti, plan a community removal.

-- If students threatened or injured, consider overnight community or dean watch at dorm.

-- Make sure victimized students are helped by victims' advocate.

-- Disciplinary "fast track" system should be started if conduct sanctionable.

-- Bring in intergroup relations experts.

Prejudice Reduction Plan Highlights

-- Publicly affirm commitment to bias-free campus.

-- Survey campus bigotry level.

-- Remove all offensive symbols.

-- Train staff and campus security.

-- Consider changes in all phases of campus life, including curriculum, dorm assignments, hiring practices, intergroup relations courses, etc.

-- Enlist every segment of campus life -- from umbrella educational institutions and boards of trustees down to janitors and maintenance workers -- in plans to reduce bigotry.

-- Plan intergroup programs that bring students from diverse backgrounds to work together.

Groups That Need to Develop the Committment to, and the Structures for, Managing Diversity

-- Government

-- Educational Associations

-- Board of Trustees

-- Presidents

-- Vice Presidents

-- Deans

-- Faculty

-- Instructors and Graduate Assistants

-- Dorm Counsellors

-- Students

-- Security

-- Line Staff

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many busy people volunteered to review various drafts of this paper. They all offered valuable suggestions and profound insights. Most central to the review process was Dr. Robert L. Hess, president of Brooklyn College. His clarity, energy and commitment to countering bigotry improved the paper immeasurably.

My sincere thanks also go to: Dr. Ellen Futter, president of Barnard College; Dr. Alice Chandler, president of SUNY-New Paltz; Dr. Paul LeClerc, president of Hunter College; Dr. David Steinberg, president of Long Island University; Dr. Charles J. Bensman, president of Thomas More College; Sr. Francis Marie Thrailkill, president, College of Mount St. Joseph; Dr. Merelyn Bates Min, Xavier University; Dr. Myrtis H. Powell, Miami University; Noreen Pomerantz, Northern Kentucky University; Dr. Carl Rheins, Adelphi University; Dr. William Shulman, Queensboro Community College; Dr. Naomi Levine, New York University; Dr. Frederick Preston, SUNY-Stony Brook; Fran Hess, Larry Thorpe, Lorraine Meyer, Eleanor Lazarus, John Youkilis, David B. Schwartz, M.D, Steve Lazarus, Sukey Altman, Deanne Basofin, Dr. Paul Bloustein, Lewis Goldberg, Joan Porat, Julie Shifman, Steve Shifman, Charles Tobias, Rabbi Gary Zola, Dr. Howard Ehrlich, Jeffrey Ross, Helina Lasser, Rabbi Robert Kaplan, Rabbi Marjorie Slome, David Hurwitz, Dr. Ruth Cowan, and my colleagues in the National Office of the American Jewish Committee.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Institute of Human Relations
165 East 56th Street
New York, New York 10022-2746

May 1990

Single copy $3.50
Quantity prices on request